

SLAM auto-complete using an emergency map

Malcolm Mielle, Martin Magnusson, Henrik Andreasson, Achim J. Lilienthal

Abstract—Often, robots have to work in situations where classic sensors do not perform well. Dust, fire or smoke can corrupt laser scanners and camera measurements. In those situation, it is important to be able to reason on non-visible and unknown part of the environment. One way to achieve this is to integrate prior information in the SLAM. While previous research mainly focused on using accurate maps or aerial images as prior in the SLAM it is not always possible to get those, especially indoor.

We developed a formulation of graph-based SLAM, incorporating information from a rough prior. We focus on emergency-maps. Emergency-maps are easy to get and a support extensively used, e.g., by firemen in rescue missions. However, those maps can be outdated, information might be missing, and the scales of all rooms are typically not consistent.

We create a graph associating information from both types of maps. The graph is optimized, using a combination of robust kernels, fusing information from the emergency and the SLAM-map into one map even when faced with scale inaccuracies and inexact start poses.

We typically have more than 50% of wrong correspondences in the settings studied in this paper, and the method we propose correctly handles them. Experiments on an office environment show that, we can handle up to 69% of wrong correspondences and still get the expected result. By incorporating the emergency-map’s information in the SLAM-map, the robot can navigate and explore while taking into account places it has not yet seen. We also show that the emergency-map is enhanced by adding information not represented such as closed doors or new walls.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a search and rescue scenario, a robot needs to perform SLAM in an environment where classic sensors do not perform well. For example, in case of fire, laser scanners and cameras will have their measurements corrupted by the smoke. It is important for the operator and the robot to be able to reason on non-visible or still unknown part of the environment. One way to tackle this problem is to integrate prior information into the SLAM.

For indoor environments, emergency-maps are probably the easiest prior-maps to get. They are widely available, usually displayed on building’s walls. A use case is for firemen, who easily have access to emergency-maps during their missions. However, the maps can be outdated and new changes to the building will not be represented.

Previous works on SLAM with prior information focused on using either a topological map depicting objects [1] or a map representing an environment with no distortions or




Fig. 1: Auto-complete process. In the image, one can see a prior in blue and a robot map (transparent brown) integrated together in one map.

errors, for example aerial maps [2], [3] or highly accurate models of the environment [4], [5]. While the methods mentioned above can deal with outdated data, they assume that the prior is a metrically accurate map. Yet, an emergency map’s scale might not be uniform in order to make the drawing easier to interpret for the user. Thus, emergency-maps are an easily accessible prior-map but it is not straight forward to integrate them in SLAM using approaches from the literature [1]–[5].

We aim at enhancing the map built during the SLAM (referred to as the SLAM-map) by using information from an emergency-map. By finding correspondences between common elements of the emergency-map and the SLAM-map, we can fuse both representations into one. Using this procedure, the robot can automatically complete its map with information from the emergency-map, even when undetected by the sensors; e.g., when smoke or debris block the sensor’s field of view. The robot can also correct the emergency-map using the sensors’ measurements.

II. METHOD OUTLINE AND CONTRIBUTIONS

We create a graph representation, that we call the auto-complete graph (ACG), fusing information from the SLAM-map and the emergency-map into one. Interpreting the emergency-map is not trivial due to the lack of standardized symbology [6]. We have decided to use corners as a common landmark between emergency and SLAM-map since corners, and walls between them, are a common feature of all emergency-maps. Nodes in the ACG are the corners from

the emergency map, the robot poses, and the corners in the SLAM-map. The edges are the walls in the emergency map, the transformations associated with the scan registration between robot poses, the observations of corners in the SLAM-map, and the correspondences between emergency-map corners and SLAM corners. The ACG is then optimized, effectively fusing information from the emergency and the SLAM-map. The whole process is illustrated in Fig 1.

The contributions of the paper are :

- A formulation of graph-based SLAM that incorporates information from a rough prior map with uncertainties in scale and detail level.
- An optimization strategy adapted to the new graph formulation. It is based on a combination of robust kernels.

We also demonstrate a method for extracting corners in an NDT-map.

We first show how to build the ACG in Section III and how to optimize it in Section IV. The method is tested and validated in Section V and Section VI. Related works are covered in more detail in Section VII.

III. METHOD

To be able to use prior information we developed a framework similar to the one of Parsley and Julier [4]. They integrate planes extracted from Ordnance Survey MasterMap as constraints in the graph representation. They use gating to remove planes that do not correspond to any planes in the scans. Then, they match corresponding prior and SLAM planes using RANSAC. The framework produces a more accurate map than when running SLAM without prior information. However, the gating of the planes is done using a distance metric, by assuming uniform scale. Most of the constraints are correct correspondences between equivalent planes in the prior and the SLAM-map and do not introduce errors in the graph. We do not assume the same in our work. Also, we fit information from the prior onto the SLAM-map instead of constraining the SLAM-map with elements from the prior-map.

We use corners as common landmarks between the emergency-map and the SLAM-map. Corners are easy to extract in emergency-maps since walls are drawn clearly and corners are salient. The data association is handled differently than Parsley and Julier [4]; while they use Expectation-Maximization to find a consistent set of prior-to-robot edges, we match all closest corners together and use a Huber-kernel and Dynamic Covariance Scaling [7], [8] (DCS) in the SLAM back-end in order to increase robustness to the very high number of outlier edges found when matching an emergency-map and a SLAM-map.

We describe the method to extract the ACG elements from the SLAM-map, in Section III-A and from emergency-maps in Section III-B.

A. Processing the SLAM-map

We use NDT [9], [10] as the representation of the robot's map. NDT makes it easy to extract salient corners, and it




Fig. 2: A NDT-map and extracted corners.

has been shown that NDT allows for efficient scan registration [11], [12], planning [13] and localization in both 2D and 3D. NDT is a grid-based representation where each cell stores a Gaussian distribution representing the shape of the local surface. While mapping an environment with a range scanner, an NDT-map can be built incrementally by representing each scan as an NDT grid and, registering and fusing it with the previous map [10]. In our work, we only consider a subset of all robot poses and associate each one with a partial view of the environment, or partial NDT-map. The partial NDT-map is built iteratively until the robot goes further than a certain distance, at which point a new NDT-map is started.

Note that the approach presented in this paper does not hinge on using NDT as the representation of the robot map. Other representations could be used, as long as it is possible to extract salient corners.

To find corners in each NDT-map, we analyze every cell with measurements, i.e. each cell that has a Gaussian. A cell is a corner if: 1) it has more than one neighbor with a Gaussian, 2) at least two of those neighbors' Gaussian's orientations form an angle between 80 and 100 degrees. By computing the rays following the main directions of the Gaussians and calculating their collision point, the estimated position of the corner is determined.

However, this method depends on the size of the neighborhood observed at every point. Some corners can be overlooked if one considers a small neighborhood that does not have enough measurements, as seen in Fig 2b. In our work, the neighborhood size considered is 2. A resulting NDT map with detected corners can be seen in Fig 2a.

B. Processing the emergency-map

Emergency-maps offer few features, as in Fig 3a. The maps usually only represent walls and some elements, such as the position of extinguishers, stairs or toilets. We do not use those extra elements as they might not be consistently represented between different emergency-maps [6].

A corner in the emergency-map is, either a place where the line orientation abruptly deviates with an angle of 80°




Fig. 3: Pre (Fig 3a) and post processed emergency map (Fig 3b and Fig 3c). Because of the scale uncertainties and artifacts due to symbols, the graph extracted is not an accurate representation of the environment.

or more, or a place where a line splits in multiple lines, i.e a crossing. Using a line follower algorithm, all corners and the lines between them are extracted from the emergency-map, as can be seen in Fig 3c. The line follower is able to take into account non-perfect walls, due to, e.g., uneven line thickness of the walls in the thresholded image of the emergency map.

C. Graph formulation

The ACG is built using the information extracted previously from the SLAM and emergency maps. After optimization, the ACG must include not yet seen parts of the environment in the SLAM-map, while taking into account the emergency-map non-uniform scale.

The structure of the ACG can be seen in Fig 4.

1) *Elements from the NDT-maps*: robot poses are directly added as pose-nodes in the ACG, while the registrations between partial NDT-maps are odometry-edges.

All the corners extracted from the NDT-maps are landmark-nodes in the ACG. The observation measurements between landmark-nodes and the pose-nodes from where they were detected are observations-edges. To fit the emergency-map on the SLAM-map, the SLAM-map must be rigid. Hence, the observation-edges' covariances' standard deviation was fixed to $\sqrt{0.05}$ m for the $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{y}$ axis, to only allow for small movements of the landmark-corners around their respective pose-node.

2) *Elements from the emergency-map*: the corners from the emergency-map are prior-nodes in the graph and walls between them are prior-edges.

We assume that we have a good, albeit not perfect, idea of the transformation between both maps. This can be obtained using known equivalent points in both maps. This initial estimate is used to initialize the prior-nodes' positions. The initial lengths of the prior-edges are computed from the distance between the prior-nodes.

While emergency-maps have uncertainties in scale and proportion, they are structurally consistent and we aim at preserving that geometric consistency when needed. Prior-edges should be hard to rotate but easy to extend or shrink. Thus, each prior-edge possesses a covariance with a high value along its main axis but a small one on the perpendicular axis. The covariance matrix in the prior-edges can be defined as $\Sigma V = V L$ where Σ is the covariance matrix, V is




Fig. 4: The ACG graph structure fusing information from the SLAM-map and the emergency-map. Link-edges are in yellow, prior-edges in blue, registration between pose-nodes in orange and landmark observations in light gray.

the matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of Σ and L is the diagonal matrix whose non-zero elements are the corresponding eigenvalues. By computing $\Sigma = V L V^{-1}$ we obtain the desired translation-covariance.

To align the covariance with the edge axis, the first eigenvector is simply the direction of the edge while the second eigenvector is a perpendicular vector. We associate a high eigenvalue to the first eigenvector, and a small eigenvalue to the second one. The calculation of the first eigenvalue depends on the length of the prior-edge and the cost of deforming a prior-edge is inversely proportional to its original length. See Section V-B, where we experimented with different values for the first eigenvalue. To keep the second eigenvalue small, it is fixed at 0.005.

3) *Matching the corners*: to associate each corner extracted from the NDT-maps with potential correspondences in the prior map, an edge between every landmark-node and every prior-node is added to the ACG, if the distance between them is less than a certain threshold. Those link-edges represent a zero transformation and the standard deviation is set to $\sqrt{0.5}$ m on the $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{y}$ axis to account for possible noise. Effectively, the linked corners are allowed to move uniformly around each other, but they can't go far from each other without increasing cost.

IV. OPTIMIZATION

Now that we have a graph representation of the environment, the next step is to optimize it to find the best solution given the constraints in the graph. With each new pose-node added to the ACG, we run a sequence of steps that we will call a cycle. These steps include, finding all correspondences between prior and landmark-nodes, optimizing by running 10 iterations with a Huber kernel, followed by 20 iterations with DCS.


While the Huber kernel guarantees unicity of the solution since it is a convergent ρ -function, the result is still influenced by incorrect link-edges between non-corresponding emergency-map and SLAM-map corners, see Fig 5c. Thus, the Huber optimization is followed by 20 iterations using DCS [8] which removes the effect of large errors, by dynamically scaling down the information matrices in edges that introduce a large error in the graph.




(a) Optimization result when using a Huber kernel first followed by DCS. The emergency-map is fitted onto the SLAM-map.



(b) Result of the optimization when no robust kernel is used. Huge deformations due to incorrect corner association are visible in the red circles.



(c) Optimization result when only a Huber kernel is used. Deformations due to incorrect corner association are still visible in the red circles.



(d) Optimization result when only DCS is used. The partial NDT-maps have been moved and don't fit together.

Fig. 5: Different results of the optimization using different optimization strategies. Link-edges are in yellow, prior-edges in blue and the SLAM-map is in light brown.

Only link-edges can be considered outliers by the optimization and each link-edge is associated with a kernel delta of 1. The delta is the window size of the error; a squared error above δ^2 is considered an outlier.

V. METHOD EVALUATION

We ran our method using data from Örebro University's basements, using a picture of the emergency-map, available in the basement, as the prior (see Fig 3a).

A. Influence of the robust kernel on the optimization

We evaluate the influence of the robust kernels and confirm that using a combination of a Huber Kernel and DCS is the best optimization strategy. We compare our strategy's result (Fig 5a) with the results when no robust kernels are used (Fig 5b), when only a Huber kernel is used (Fig 5c), and when only DCS is used (Fig 5d).

In Fig 5a, one can see the result of the optimization when using a Huber kernel first, followed by DCS. The emergency-map is fitted onto the SLAM-map and we obtain the expected result. Using no robust kernel, as in Fig 5b, the emergency-map is not correctly fitted on the SLAM-map and the result is not consistent with the actual environment. The emergency-map is better fitted when using only Huber, as in Fig 5c, but still is not the expected result. When only DCS is used, as in Fig 5d, the SLAM-map is corrupted. By scaling down




Fig. 6: Convergence plot for the optimization strategy: the mean error (chi) is calculated over 28 cycles. Optimization with the Huber kernel reaches stability at around 5 iterations, while DCS does after 13 additional iterations.

the error of some edges, without first converging toward an approximate solution, the NDT-maps are moved to fit better with wrong link-edges. The structural consistency of the SLAM-map is not maintained due to the high number of wrong link-edges.

Using no robust kernel, only Huber, or only DCS, leads to worse results than our strategy: using Huber first followed by DCS.

In Fig 6, one can see the convergence plot of the graph when performing 10 iterations with a Huber kernel followed by 20 iterations with DCS. Fig 6 shows the mean error value at each step over 28 cycles. One can see that, the Huber kernel reaches stability in around 5 iterations and DCS reaches stability in around 13 iterations.

It should be noted that, because DCS scales the covariances of some link-edges, allowing them to move further from their mean value, the error plotted in Fig 6 increases after optimization.

B. Prior covariance


In order to evaluate the influence of the prior-edges' covariance, the size of the covariance along the main axis was changed to a certain percentage of the length.

In Fig 7b, one can see that using 1% of the edge length leads to the prior map not being changed but just translated and rotated to fit the SLAM-map as best as possible. In Fig 7d, the prior and SLAM-map are not fitted together when using 100% of the length. While the matching would be perfect without any wrong link-edges, this much flexibility in the prior-edges lead the optimization to a sub-optimal solution, even when using robust kernels. Using 50% gives the best result, since the prior is fitted onto the SLAM-map, and incorrect corner correspondences do not influence the result, as seen in Fig 7c.

C. Maximum number of outlier link-edges


We estimated the maximum amount of wrong link-edges we can have in the graph before the optimization fails.

We ran a total of 26 optimizations, totaling 13 successes and 13 failures. An optimization was considered failed if at least one prior landmark was at an incorrect position



(a) No optimization. The SLAM-map is only drawn over the prior.

(b) Using 1% of a prior-edge length to calculate its covariance. In the red circle, the prior was not fitted on the robot measurement because it is too rigid.



(c) Using 50% of a prior-edge length to calculate its covariance. The prior and SLAM-map are correctly fitted together.



(d) Using 100% of a prior-edge length to calculate its covariance. The prior was not rigid enough and is incorrectly fitted on the SLAM-map due to wrong link-edges.

Fig. 7: Results of the optimization with different percentage of the edge's length used for the prior's covariance.

in the SLAM-map. The percentages of outliers for each optimization are presented in Fig 8.

To confirm that the number of outliers is correlated with the success of the optimization, we first test if the mean of the success sample is significantly less than the mean of the failures sample. The z-score of the max and min of the percentage of outliers for success and failure samples are within a 3σ event and we can assume normality. We ran Welch's t-test, which does not assume equality of variances. Here the sign of the t-statistic is important since we are testing a "less than" hypothesis of a one-tailed t-test. If $t < 0$ and $p_{value}/2 < 0.05$, we can reject the hypothesis that both distributions are similar. With our sample, $t = -4.756$ and the $p_{value} = 8.377 \cdot 10^{-5}$, showing a significant difference between the two distributions.

For the failure case, 1.5 standard deviations under the mean represents 69% of outliers, meaning 86% of the failure cases have more than 69% of outliers. For the success case, 1.5 standard deviations above the mean is equivalent to 79%, which means that 86% of the success cases have under 79% of outliers. With 1.5 standard deviations, only one success and one failure are out of the prediction in our samples.

We can handle up to 69% outliers at the end of the optimization according to the data. Anecdotically, the optimization can fail under 69%, like one case in Fig 8. It should be noted that the final result only had 2 nodes over





Fig. 8: Success cases are in green, and failure ones are in red. The grey zone is within 1.5 sigma of both the success and failure mean.



(a) An ACG with over 80% of outliers (yellow edges).

(b) Same image as in Fig 9a but without the link-edges displayed.

Fig. 9: Even with a high percentage of outliers the optimization sometimes leads to the expected result.

13 wrongly matched and was very close to a success case. The optimization will almost certainly fail if there is more than 79% of outliers. It can occasionally succeed, as in Fig 9.

Error in the starting pose will increase the number of outliers and in our setup we can tolerate about $\pm 10^\circ$ degree of rotation around the actual starting pose.


VI. EXPERIMENTS

We evaluated the integration of the emergency-map with the SLAM-map. During the experiment, the framework runs online, and a correction of the pose-nodes gets propagated to the next measurements. For the two parameters, we used 2 m as the minimum distance between two corners before creating a link-edge, to get less than 71% of outliers as seen in Section V-C, and 50% as the eigenvalue for the prior-edges' covariances.


At any time in the exploration, the robot uses a map that integrates the emergency and the SLAM map. Using this map, the robot can be sent to places it has not yet explored or seen, while taking in account, information from its scans.

In Fig 10a, the robot has only been exploring for a short time but can find a path toward its destination, even though it has not explored that part of the environment yet.

In Fig 10b, the robot has collected more information and now knows that the first path it found toward its goal is not practicable. A door is closed and the robot can not pass through it. The robot could now reason about the presence of a door in the environment: find a way to open the door, search for new possible paths in the emergency-map or stop the exploration.



(a) The robot found a path to a room in the emergency maps that was not yet visited by the robot.



(b) The robot added a door that wasn't closed in the emergency-map and the path can not be found anymore.

Fig. 10: Searching for a path at different steps.

VII. PREVIOUS WORK

This section relates our approach to the state of the art and further details how we extend on it.

Most integration of prior maps into the graph-SLAM problem used realistic priors. Vysotska and Stachniss [5] match maps obtained from openStreetMap onto the robot scans. They use the robot position computed by ICP [14] to introduce a correcting factor in the error function used in the graph-SLAM. The method allows up to $\pm 40^\circ$ of error in orientation between the map and the robot's heading. However, their method can not be used with emergency maps; the local scale of the emergency does not correspond to the robot scans and ICP can not deform the maps.

Parsley and Julier [4] developed another framework based on enhancing SLAM using graph-SLAM and openStreetMap. Their framework was presented in Section III.

Another idea is to consider the prior-map as a topological environment representation. Shah and Campbell [1] use a human-provided map representing distinct landmarks to create waypoints using the Voronoi–Delaunay graph. The prior-map is matched onto the robot map using the positions of the landmarks, detected by the robot and those on the sketch, to estimate an affine transformation in a weighted least square problem. The landmarks are independent, uniquely identifiable buildings. Indoor, the parallel could be made by using objects, but annotated maps are not always easy to get. Furthermore, the prior's scale is uniform, which that does not hold when considering emergency-maps.

Oßwald, Bennewitz, et al. [15] developed an exploration strategy that uses rough-maps to help the robot in its navigation task. They use topo-metrical maps and the traveling salesman problem to find the most efficient global exploration path in the prior. The topo-metrical maps are provided by users. Their method works as long as the frontiers of unexplored zone in the robot map can be assigned correctly to graph nodes from the prior, making the matching of the prior onto the SLAM-map a key problem. Since the focus of the work of Oßwald, Bennewitz, et al. [15] is on the exploration method, there is no clear explanation on how to match the prior onto the SLAM-map.

Skubic, et al.[16]–[18] use a sketch-map interface for

navigation which enables robots to derive and use qualitative spatial relations from the sketch in real life. Objects are closed polygons drawn by the user. The descriptors, used to match the drawn objects to the ones seen by the robot, are histograms of forces. Since objects are not represented in emergency-maps, their method is not applicable to our situation.

In our previous work [19], we developed a method to find correspondences between a sketch-map and a ground truth-map. To interpret the sketch-map, we use a Voronoi diagram obtained from the distance image on which a thinning parameter is used to remove spurious branches. The diagram is extracted as a graph and an efficient error-tolerant graph matching algorithm is used to find correspondences. However, the method cannot be directly used on a SLAM-map making it unusable for our case.

Freksa, Moratz, et al. [20] use a schematic map to navigate a robot. The schematic map represents the environment but simplifying shapes and structures to make the map more readable. They find correspondences between elements of the schematic map and the environment by matching corners. They tested their method on a simple environment with three rooms. The robot is able to see the whole room with a single panoramic view. Corner extraction is perfect, and there is no clutter, and no wrong elements in the prior-map, making the method too simple for emergency-maps.

Kümmerle, Steder, et al. [3] used aerial-maps as prior in a graph-based SLAM. They insert correspondences between stereo and three-dimensional range data and the aerial images as constraints in the graph. They use edges in both modalities and Monte-Carlo-Localization to find the correspondences before optimizing the graph. However, while inserting correspondences, they assume a constant scale in the aerial image, which we can not do with emergency-maps.

Boniardi, Behzadian, et al. [21] present an approach for robot localization and navigation based on a hand-drawn sketch of the environment. They use an extension of the Monte-Carlo Localization algorithm to track the robot pose. They approximate the deformation between the sketch-map and the real-world using two scale factors. They do not assume a constant scale of the prior but they assume that the sketch respects orthogonality and parallelism of the real world. While in our work, we try to maintain orthogonality and parallelism, it is not a requirement since we fit the emergency-map on the robot measurements.

VIII. FUTURE WORK

In the future we plan on working on having better correspondences between the emergency-map and the robot-map. Introducing corner orientation will help in determining which link-edges are correct. Also, we will evaluate our method using other SLAM datasets for which emergency maps (or other rough prior maps) are available, and with smoke conditions.

IX. CONCLUSION

We developed a formulation of graph-based SLAM, incorporating information from a rough prior. The prior has uncer-

tainties in scale and detail level. We have also presented an optimization strategy adapted to this new graph formulation.

For both maps, we use corners as a common element to find correspondences between the prior and the SLAM-map. We use those correspondences to create a graph fusing information from the two modalities. Contrary to other works [1]–[5], we do not use the prior-map to bind the SLAM-map. We match the prior-map onto the robot data to complete missing information and unexplored areas, while accounting for the uncertainties of the prior.

We first use a Huber kernel followed by DCS to obtain robust results. Using this strategy, we can handle up to 69% of wrong correspondences between corners from the prior-map and the SLAM-map.

Experiments showed that the emergency-map and SLAM-map fused together, provide more information to the robot. The robot is able to use the final map to navigate and plan the exploration, potentially taking in account places with smoke and inaccuracies in the emergency-map. The result is better than when no optimization is used, with more consistent results after optimization.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. C. Shah and M. E. Campbell, “A qualitative path planner for robot navigation using human-provided maps,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 32, no. 13, pp. 1517–1535, Nov. 1, 2013, ISSN: 0278-3649, 1741-3176.
- [2] M. Persson, T. Duckett, and A. J. Lilienthal, “Fusion of aerial images and sensor data from a ground vehicle for improved semantic mapping,” *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, From Sensors to Human Spatial Concepts, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 483–492, Jun. 30, 2008, ISSN: 0921-8890.
- [3] R. Kümmerle, B. Steder, C. Dornhege, A. Kleiner, G. Grisetti, and W. Burgard, “Large scale graph-based SLAM using aerial images as prior information,” *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 25–39, Jan. 2011, ISSN: 0929-5593, 1573-7527.
- [4] M. P. Parsley and S. J. Julier, “Towards the exploitation of prior information in SLAM,” in *Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2010 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, IEEE, 2010, pp. 2991–2996.
- [5] O. Vysotska and C. Stachniss, “Exploiting building information from publicly available maps in graph-based SLAM,” in *Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 4511–4516.
- [6] U. J. Dymon, “An analysis of emergency map symbology,” *International Journal of Emergency Management*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 227–237, 2003.
- [7] P. Agarwal, G. D. Tipaldi, L. Spinello, C. Stachniss, and W. Burgard, “Robust map optimization using dynamic covariance scaling,” in *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*, IEEE, 2013, pp. 62–69.
- [8] P. Agarwal, “Robust graph-based localization and mapping,” PhD thesis, PhD thesis, University of Freiburg, Germany, 2015.
- [9] P. Biber and W. Straßer, “The normal distributions transform: A new approach to laser scan matching,” in *Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2003.(IROS 2003). Proceedings. 2003 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, vol. 3, IEEE, 2003, pp. 2743–2748.
- [10] T. Stoyanov, J. Saarinen, H. Andreasson, and A. J. Lilienthal, “Normal distributions transform occupancy map fusion: Simultaneous mapping and tracking in large scale dynamic environments,” in *2013 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, IEEE, 2013, pp. 4702–4708.
- [11] M. Magnusson, A. Lilienthal, and T. Duckett, “Scan registration for autonomous mining vehicles using 3d-NDT,” *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 803–827, 2007.
- [12] M. Magnusson, N. Vaskevicius, T. Stoyanov, K. Pathak, and A. Birk, “Beyond points: Evaluating recent 3d scan-matching algorithms,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, IEEE, 2015, pp. 3631–3637.
- [13] T. Stoyanov, M. Magnusson, H. Andreasson, and A. J. Lilienthal, “Path planning in 3d environments using the normal distributions transform,” in *Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2010 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, IEEE, 2010, pp. 3263–3268.
- [14] P. J. Besl and N. D. McKay, “A method for registration of 3-d shapes,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 239–256, Feb. 1992, ISSN: 0162-8828.
- [15] S. Oßwald, M. Bennewitz, W. Burgard, and C. Stachniss, “Speeding-up robot exploration by exploiting background information,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 716–723, Jul. 2016, ISSN: 2377-3766.
- [16] M. Skubic, D. Anderson, S. Blisard, D. Perzanowski, and A. Schultz, “Using a hand-drawn sketch to control a team of robots,” *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 399–410, Mar. 20, 2007, ISSN: 0929-5593, 1573-7527.
- [17] M. Skubic, C. Bailey, and G. Chronis, “A sketch interface for mobile robots,” in *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 2003. IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 1, IEEE, 2003, pp. 919–924.
- [18] G. Parekh, M. Skubic, O. Sjahputera, and J. M. Keller, “Scene matching between a map and a hand drawn sketch using spatial relations,” in *Robotics and Automation, 2007 IEEE International Conference on*, IEEE, 2007, pp. 4007–4012.
- [19] M. Mielle, M. Magnusson, and A. J. Lilienthal, “Using sketch-maps for robot navigation: Interpretation and matching,” in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Safety, Security, and Rescue Robotics (SSRR)*, Oct. 2016, pp. 252–257.
- [20] C. Freksa, R. Moratz, and T. Barkowsky, “Schematic maps for robot navigation,” in *Spatial Cognition II*, DOI: 10.1007/3-540-45460-8.8, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000, pp. 100–114, ISBN: 10.1007/3-540-45460-8.8.
- [21] F. Boniardi, B. Behzadian, W. Burgard, and G. D. Tipaldi, “Robot navigation in hand-drawn sketched maps,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Mobile Robotics (ECMR)*, 2015.